UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,190	07/30/2003	Muthu Senthil	ORCL-2003-032-01	3952

45591 7590 09/03/2008

ORACLE C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2164	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,190	SENTHIL, MUTHU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 May 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendment received on 5/12/2008, in response to the Office Action mailed on 12/11/2007. This amendment has been entered with amended claims 1, 6, 14, 18 and 20. In this Office Action, claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-13 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1-13 are directed to nonstatutory subject matter. A process that merely manipulates an abstract idea or performs a purely mathematical algorithm is nonstatutory despite the fact that it might inherently have some usefulness. In Sarkar, 588 F.2d at 1335, 200 USPQ at 139. See recent court case, In-Re Comiskey, ___,Fed. Cir., 2007____ decided 9/20/2007. (see MPEP 2106(IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii)). In this case, claims 1-5 have to be amended as "computer implemented method" in place of "method" to overcome the rejection. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 6, 14, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For Example, claim1, line 5, as "automating data entry, processing or reporting for a database", and claim 18, lines 6-7 as "automating data entry, processing or reporting" are incomplete claim limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kilpatrick et al. (US Patent 6,742,124) hereinafter Kilpatrick, in view of Chan et al. (US Patent 6,697,844) hereinafter Chan and in view of Duffey (USPA Pub. US 20040243501 A1).

7. As per independent claim 1, Kilpatrick teaches an intrusion detection operating efficiently in real-time. Computational efficiency is generated through the representation of known sequences of system calls in a distance matrix. The distance matrix indirectly specifies known sequences by specifying allowable separation distances between parts of systems (col. 3, lines 11-16). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating a Levenshtein matrix of said first string and said second string (Fig. 6, col. 10, lines 7-10). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, determining a Levenshtein distance from said Levenshtein matrix (Fig. 6, col. 10, lines 27-28). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, determining if first string is a match to second string based upon said similarity (col. 11, lines 8-10).

Kilpatrick does not explicitly teach largest common substring between strings. However, Chan teaches the claimed, determining a largest common substring (Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 2-6). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Chan's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to reduce the amount of latency by caching and prefetching components of electronic mail messages using information relating to similar objects that were previously supplied to the client by the mail server (col. 2, lines 22-25 and lines 33-35).

Kilpatrick and Chan do not explicitly teach automating data entry, processing or reporting. However, Duffey teaches the claimed, automating data entry, processing or reporting for a database including at least one of said first or second strings based upon said Levenshtein distance and said largest common substring (Fig. 8A, col. 13,

lines 45-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Duffey's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to bridge the gap between any e-mail communications and the vendor's order processing system (page 1, paragraph [0007]).

8. As per dependent claim 2, Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, determining a largest common substring from said Levenshtein distance matrix comprises determining a longest diagonal of equal hamming distances of a lowest value.(Fig. 5, Table 2, col. 9, lines 31-45).

9. As per dependent claim 3 Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating a Levenshtein score (Fig. 5, col. 9, lines 44-45).

10. As per dependent claim 4, further comprising determining the length of the largest common substring (Fig. 5, Table 2, col. 9, lines 31-35).

11. As per dependent claim 5, further comprising calculating a largest common substring score (Fig. 5, Table 2, col. 9, lines 31-35).

12. Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kilpatrick et al. (US Patent 6,742,124) hereinafter Kilpatrick, in view of Haigh et al.

(USPA Pub. 2003/0004716 A1) hereinafter Haigh, and in view of Chan et al (US Patent 6,697,844) hereinafter Chan and further in view of Duffey (USPA Pub. US 20040243501 A1).

13. As per independent claim 6, Kilpatrick teaches an intrusion detection operating efficiently in real-time. Computational efficiency is generated through the representation of known sequences of system calls in a distance matrix. The distance matrix indirectly specifies known sequences by specifying allowable separation distances between parts of systems (col. 3, lines 11-16). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating a Levenshtein matrix of a first string and a second string (Fig. 6, col. 10, lines 7-10). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, determining a Levenshtein distance from said Levenshtein matrix (Fig. 6, col. 10, lines 27-28). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, determining if first string is a match to second string based upon said similarity (col. 11, lines 8-10).

Kilpatrick does not explicitly teach largest common substring between strings. However, Haigh teaches the claimed, determining a largest common substring (Fig. 6, page 5, paragraph [0053-0054]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating a

Levenshtein score as a function of said Levenshtein distance (Fig. 6, col. 9, lines 44-45). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating a largest common substring score as a function of said largest common substring (Fig. 6, Table 2, col. 9, lines 31-35).

Kilpatrick and Haigh do not explicitly teach determining similarity between two strings. However, Chan teaches the claimed, determining a similarity between a set of characters in said first string and a set of characters in said second string as a function of said Levenshtein distance and said largest common substring (Fig. 4-5, 7A-B, col. 9, lines 2-6 and col. 10, lines 55-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Chan's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to reduce the amount of latency by caching and prefetching components of electronic mail messages using information relating to similar objects that were previously supplied to the client by the mail server (col. 2, lines 22-25 and lines 33-35).

Kilpatrick, Haigh and Chan do not explicitly teach automating data entry, processing or reporting. However, Duffey teaches the claimed, automating data entry, processing or reporting for a database including at least one of said first or second strings based upon said Levenshtein distance and said largest common substring (Fig. 8A, col. 13, lines 45-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Duffey's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's

method to bridge the gap between any e-mail communications and the vendor's order processing system (page 1, paragraph [0007]).

14. As per dependent claim 7, Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating an acronym score of said first string and said second string (Fig. 6, col. 9, lines 44-45).

15. As per dependent claim 8, Kilpatrick and Haigh combined teaches claim 6. Haigh teaches the claimed, calculating a weighted acronym score comprising a product of said acronym score and an acronym weight factor (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

16. As per dependent claim 9, Kilpatrick and Haigh combined teaches claim 6. Haigh teaches the claimed, calculating a weighted Levenshtein score comprising a product of said Levenshtein score and a Levenshtein weight factor calculating a weighted largest common substring score comprising a product of said largest common substring score and a largest common substring weight factor and calculating a Levenshtein largest common substring score comprising a sum of said weighted Levenshtein score and said weighted largest common substring score (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

17. As per dependent claim 10, Kilpatrick and Haigh combined teaches claim 6. Haigh teaches the claimed, a sum of said Levenshtein weight factor and said largest common substring weight factor is equal to one (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

18. As per dependent claim 11, Kilpatrick and Haigh combined teaches claim 6. Haigh teaches the claimed, calculating a first weighted numerical score, comprising a product of said Levenstein/largest common substring score and a string weight factor (Fig..7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to

overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

19. As per dependent claim 12, Kilpatrick and Haigh combined teaches claim 6. Haigh teaches the claimed, calculating an acronym score, calculating a weighted acronym score comprising a product of said acronym score and an acronym weight factor and calculating a second weighted numerical score comprising a sum of said first weighted numerical score and said weighted acronym score of said first string and said second string (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

20. As per dependent claim 13, Kilpatrick and Haigh combined teaches claim 6. Haigh teaches the claimed, a sum of said string weight factor and said acronym weight factor is equal to one (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in

order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

21. As per independent claim 14, Kilpatrick teaches an intrusion detection operating efficiently in real-time. Computational efficiency is generated through the representation of known sequences of system calls in a distance matrix. The distance matrix indirectly specifies known sequences by specifying allowable separation distances between parts of systems (col. 3, lines 11-16). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating a Levenshtein matrix of a first string and a second string (Fig. 6, col. 10, lines 7-10). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, determining a Levenshtein distance from said Levenshtein matrix (Fig. 6, col. 10, lines 27-28). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, determining if first string is a match to second string based upon said similarity (col. 11, lines 8-10).

Kilpatrick does not explicitly teach does not teach first numerical score as function strings. However, Haigh teaches the claimed, calculating a first numerical score as a function of said Levenshtein score and said largest common substring score (Fig. 6, page 5, paragraph [0053-0054]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to • overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular

expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]). Kilpatrick does not explicitly teach largest common substring between strings. However, Chan teaches the claimed, calculating a largest common substring score as a function of Said largest common substring (Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 2-6).

Kilpatrick and Haigh do not explicitly teach largest common substring between strings. However, Chan teaches the claimed, numerical score is a first quantification of a similarity between a set of characters in said first string and a set of characters in said second string as a function of said Levenshtein distance and said largest common substring (Fig. 4-5, 7A-B, col. 9, lines 2-6 and col. 10, lines 55-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Chan's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to reduce the amount of latency by caching and prefetching components of electronic mail messages using information relating to similar objects that were previously supplied to the client by the mail server (col. 2, lines 22-25 and lines 33-35).

Kilpatrick, Haigh and Chan do not explicitly teach automating data entry, processing or reporting. However, Duffey teaches the claimed, automating data entry, processing or reporting for a database including at least one of said first or second strings based upon said Levenshtein distance and said largest common substring (Fig. 8A, col. 13, lines 45-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Duffey's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's

method to bridge the gap between any e-mail communications and the vendor's order processing system (page 1, paragraph [0007]).

22. As per dependent claim 15, Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating a subtracting the resultant of dividing said Levenshtein distance by an average of a length of said first string and a length of said second string from one (Fig. 6, col. 9, lines44-45, col. 10, lines 27-28).

23. As per dependent claim 16, Kilpatrick, Haigh and Chan combined teaches claim 14. Haigh teaches the claimed, determining a length of said largest common substring from said Levenshtein matrix and dividing said length of said largest common substring by an average of a length of said first string and a length of said second string (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0053-0054 and 0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

24. As per dependent claim 17, Kilpatrick, Haigh and Chan combined teaches claim 14. Haigh teaches the claimed, calculating a weighted Levenshtein score comprising a product of said Levenshtein score and a Levenshtein weight factor,

calculating a weighted largest common substring score comprising a product of said largest common substring score and a largest common substring weight factor and summing said weighted Levenshtein score and said weighted largest common substring score (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

25. As per dependent claim 18, Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, calculating an acronym score and calculating a second numerical score as a function of said first numerical score and said acronym score (Fig. 6, col. 9, lines 44-45). Kilpatrick teaches the claimed, automating data entry, processing or reporting based upon said similarity (col. 11, lines 8-10).

26. As per dependent claim 19, Kilpatrick, Haigh and Chan combined teaches claim 14. Haigh teaches the claimed, calculating a weighted Levenshtein score comprising a product of said Levenshtein score and a Levenshtein weight factor, calculating a weighted largest common substring score comprising a product of said largest common substring score and a largest common substring weight factor, calculating a Levenshtein largest common substring score comprising a sum of said

weighted Levenshtein score and said weighted largest common substring score, calculating a weighted Levenshtein/largest common substring score comprising a product of said Levenshtein/largest common substring score and a Levenshtein/largest common substring weight factor, calculating a weighted acronym score comprising a product of said acronym score and an acronym score weight factor and summing said weighted Levenshtein largest common substring score and said weighted acronym score (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

27. As per dependent claim 20, Kilpatrick, Haigh and Chan combined teaches claim 14. Haigh teaches the claimed, utilizing said first numerical score for automating data entry, processing or reporting, when said first string and said second string comprise numerical-type strings and utilizing said second numerical score for automating data entry, processing or reporting, when said first string or said second string comprise character-type strings (Fig. 7, page 5, paragraph [0057])..Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Haigh's teachings would have allowed Kilpatrick's method to identify and categorize text within

documents in order to overcome difficulties, time consuming and tedious while using rules or regular expressions (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/12/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and details as follows:

a) Applicant's argument stated regarding claims 1, 6, 14 as Applicant amended to overcome 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection and requesting to withdraw the rejection.

In response to Applicant argument, Examiner disagrees. Applicant's Amendment has overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 and it is not complete. Therefore, Examiner rejected amended claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph as indefinite.

b) Applicant's argument regarding claim 1 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as "the combination of Kilpatrick and Chan clearly teach away from the limitations of 'calculating a Levenshtein matrix of a first string and a second string,' 'determining a Levenshtein distance from said Levenshtein matrix,' and 'determining a largest common substring from said Levenshtein matrix' as recited in Claim 1."

In response to Applicant's argument, respectfully examiner disagrees, because, calculating a Levenshtein matrix of two strings is well known in the art.

The prior art by Kilpatrick teaches the same (Fig. 6, col. 10, lines 7-10). The second prior at by Chan teaches how to determine the largest common substring (Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 2-6). Therefore, the combination of three references teaches all limitation of claim 1. The newly added prior art by Duffey teaches the amended limitation.

c) Applicant amendment is not significant because of the "Automating". Because, as per a case law, "The claimed invention in Dann v. Johnston, 425 U.S. 219, 189 USPQ 257 (1976) was directed towards a system (i.e., computer) for automatic record keeping of bank checks and deposits."

Conclusion

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/
Primary Examiner

srp
September 3, 2008